

Gambling Sponsorship and Advertising in British Football: a critical account.

Carwyn Jones, Robyn Pinder and Gemma Robinson

Cardiff Metropolitan University – Cardiff School of Sport and Health Sciences

Abstract

Problem gambling is a growing public health issue in the UK. In this paper, we argue that football plays a problematic role in the promotion and normalisation of gambling. Given that sport broadcasts offer gambling (and alcohol) companies a loophole to avoid the post-watershed guidelines, children and young people are also exposed. By marketing gambling in general and to children in particular, football contributes to an increase in the overall ‘amount’ of gambling in society. In turn, this contributes to an increase in the prevalence of problem gambling (including gambling disorder) and all the associated harms.

Furthermore, we argue that a significant amount of gambling profits come from problem gamblers. Football therefore benefits from, and contributes to, the addictive consumption of gamblers.

Introduction

In 2017 the controversial football player Joey Barton’s career came to an end. Problem gambling is the latest in a long list of difficulties for Barton that include a jail sentence for common assault and affray, three charges of violent conduct and a stint in the Sporting Chance rehab clinic (1). In April, Barton was given an 18-month ban (later reduced to 13 months) by the Football Association (FA) for breaking strict rules prohibiting professional footballers from betting, either directly or indirectly, on footballing competition worldwide. Barton is not the first high profile athlete, nor is he the first footballer, to have suffered gambling problems. Former Welsh international striker, John Hartson, described his gambling problem as life threatening and Northern Ireland international football player, Kyle Lafferty, recently admitted to having a gambling addiction. Research conducted by the Professional Player’s Federation (2014) – focusing specifically on professional footballers and cricketers in the UK – reported that sportsmen are three times more likely to have a gambling problem compared to young men in the general population (2). Cases like Barton’s and Lafferty’s have drawn attention to the problem whilst also raising important questions about the relationship between football and the gambling industry.

Tobacco sponsorship of sport is a distant memory, but alcohol logos remain omnipresent features of the sporting landscape. The gambling industry, however, is now the dominant sponsor of football. Tobacco, alcohol and gambling are all potentially harmful, partly but not exclusively, because they are addictive. The debate about the appropriateness of alcohol marketing through sport is ongoing at least in the UK, the USA and Australia. There is also a significant body of research which explores the prevalence, influence and ethics of alcohol marketing in sport (Jones, 2016; Adams et al., 2014; O’Brien et al., 2014). Some countries, for example France, have placed a ban on all sponsorship of sport by alcohol companies (Loi Évin introduced in 1991) (3). The prevalence, influence and ethics of gambling advertising and sponsorship in sport, however, has received little attention in the sport literature (4). This paper seeks to contribute to the debate by examining the relation between gambling marketing and football in the UK. First, we defend the claim that the relationship between gambling marketing and sport is morally problematic. Our reasons focus on the harm caused by gambling in general and the risks to

children, young people and vulnerable adults in particular. Second, we describe the extent and effect of gambling marketing in football.

Background

The 2005 Gambling Act liberalised gambling in the UK and paved the way for the expansion of the gambling industry. The industry now offers a myriad of different types of gambling opportunities (roulette, bingo, poker, horse racing, lotteries, sports betting and slot machines) in a variety of locations (casinos, bingo halls, racetracks, betting shops, amusement arcades, pubs and crucially the multitude of online platforms). The act also permitted the industry to advertise their products on television, radio and other media outlets, including social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter. The rapid development in mobile technology provides the industry with instant 24 hour a day access to their customers and placing a bet is now easier than it has ever been. The growth in gambling opportunities, coupled with the active marketing of these opportunities, has resulted in huge profits for the entire gambling industry. In 2016, the Gambling Commission reported that the UK gambling industry earned just under £14 billion from UK customers alone (5) - this was a 65% increase from 2008. Opponents of the liberalisation of gambling claim that the gambling act has been used as a means to create huge profits for the industry and as a valuable tax revenue source for the government (Orford, 2011). The corollary, however, has been the public health costs incurred due to the increase in gambling, problem gambling, and the associated harms. GambleAware commissioned a study in 2016 that found problem gamblers now cost the government between £260 million - £1.2 billion a year (6).

Gambling is a paradigm 'process addiction' and 'gambling disorder' has now been included in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) (7). Gambling disorder can be described as persistent and recurrent problematic gambling behaviour leading to clinically significant impairment or distress (Yau & Potenza, 2015). It is characterised by preoccupation, an inability to stop, restlessness or irritability when trying to stop and gambling in secret. It can lead to borrowing or stealing money and losing one's relationships or career as a result of gambling (among other things). The harmful consequences of disordered gambling can be numerous, significant, and affect both the gambler, friends and family. The harms caused by gambling are more difficult to quantify than those caused by alcohol or tobacco, but include financial loss, bankruptcy, low productivity, family breakdown, criminal activity and clinically significant emotional and psychological problems (Dickerson, 2003). Testimonies from problem gamblers emphasise the distress they have experienced and may still experience. John Hartson, for example, opined that "there are four places you can end up as a compulsive gambler: out on the street, in jail, dead or at Gamblers Anonymous" (8).

Not all gamblers will develop problems such as Hartson, Barton or Lafferty but the number of problem gamblers is increasing, especially within sport. According to Sporting Chance, a rehabilitation centre for professional sportspeople, 70% of their referrals are for gambling related problems. There are a host of factors that contribute to the risk of developing a problem with gambling including; facts about the product (type and availability - 9), society's attitudes towards consumption (liberal/conservative and what counts as a vice/acceptable behaviour), early experiences of gambling (exposure to parents' use and normalising influences such as portrayals on television), one's socio-demographic background, the rewards associated with the activity (financial, status, fitting in with the crowd), genetic vulnerability and personality factors such as

risk-taking likeliness (Orford, 2011). Whilst none of these factors are sufficient to cause addiction in isolation, each increases the risk of addiction. In this paper, we are particularly interested in normalising and availability factors. The Australian Psychological Society claim that:

The proliferation of gambling advertising within sport has the effect of normalising it, making it an integral component of sporting activities and an accepted part of participating and enjoying sports, and particularly influencing the attitudes of children and young people (10).

Gambling marketing in sport – a vicious cycle

There are two closely related arguments we present in order to condemn the current relationship between gambling and football. The first is a straightforward consequentialist argument. The relationship contributes to an increase in the overall ‘amount’ of gambling in society. In turn this contributes to an increase in the prevalence of problem gambling (including gambling disorder) and all the associated harms. Increasing harm in society is *ceteris paribus* a bad thing. The second argument is that a significant amount of gambling profits come from problem gamblers. Football, therefore, benefits from, and contributes to, the addictive consumption of gamblers.

The gambling industry (like alcohol and tobacco before them) claim disingenuously that marketing is aimed at increasing market share and not at increasing the number of gamblers or the amount gambled. Their activities play no part in problem gambling. Yet the figures above show that earnings for gambling companies increased by 65%. This means that more people are gambling, or gamblers are staking more, or both. At the same time problem gambling has increased substantially. It is beneficial to suppliers of products like gambling and alcohol to promulgate the idea that there is no causal relationship here – the ‘fault’ for problematic consumption lies with the individual, not the product or its promotion. Weak-willed or ill-disciplined individuals gamble excessively, the argument goes, whereas sensible and reasonable people can consume moderately. Orford (2011: 103) argues that although psychology and neuro psychology are revealing more about shared ‘vulnerability’ characteristics of addicts (impulsivity vulnerability theory), such findings do not prove that only certain individuals with ‘addictive personality’ are vulnerable. There is clear evidence that the ‘supply’ of gambling opportunities has had a significant impact on the prevalence of problem gambling. Research suggests that gambling is ‘producer driven rather than consumer driven’ (Orford 2011: 107).

The more opportunities there are to gamble, the higher the prevalence of gambling and of problem gambling in the population. Grun and McKeigue (2000) found that gambling expenditure and problem gambling increased significantly following the introduction of the National Lottery in the UK in 1994. From a public health perspective, this phenomenon is called the ‘Single Distribution Theory’ (Rose 1985: 37) and informs a particular approach to combatting problem gambling. Limiting gambling opportunities will reduce gambling harm, increasing them will increase harms. Football is firmly in the promoting and increasing opportunities side of this equation.

The second ethical problem is that if one accepts investment from gambling companies, one is accepting money which comes from the pockets of problem gamblers. A significant proportion of the gambling (and alcohol) industries’ profits come from

problematic or excessive consumption. Recent figures show that 4.4% the population in England are drinking nearly 30% of the alcohol consumed (11). According to Adams (2016:4) problem or addicted consumers aren't more numerous than ordinary consumers, '...but their excess consumption means that they spend considerably more money and are, therefore, responsible for a larger proportion of the profits'. This 'addiction surplus' – 'money left over by subtracting the amount spent by non-addicted and non-problem consumers from the total spend by all customers' – is significant (Adams 2016: 10). Only around 2.3% of the population are considered to be problem gamblers, but they account for between 40-50% of expenditure on gambling, therefore, half the profits come from people consuming in damaging and harmful ways (Adams 2016: 4). Football plays a dual role in revenue generation for the gambling industry. It promotes and markets the plethora of gambling opportunities and provides the uncertain events on which to bet (using mobile phone apps, an individual may place almost an unlimited number of bets during a particular game on anything from the next scorer to the next yellow card) (12). According to Sportradar (betting and sports data analysts) the sports match-betting industry (legal and illegal) is worth anywhere between \$700bn and \$1tn (£435bn to £625bn) a year (13).

Televised football and gambling

Our claim is that football plays a key role in the promotion and normalisation of gambling and, therefore, in the prevalence of problem gambling. To be more precise, football is normalising a particular form of gambling practice which involves betting on the results of football matches and other 'in-play' markets such as goals scored, next goal scorer or some such. The use of mobile devices to place the bets is also a prominent feature of the practice. This happens mostly, but not exclusively through direct advertising and sponsorship. The Twitter feeds of high-profile players turned commentators such as Robbie Savage and Dietmar Hamann also feature regular gambling references and the popular commercial radio station talkSport's broadcasts are shot through with talk of gambling. It is very difficult to quantify such 'indirect' coverage, therefore, in this paper we focus on the direct marketing and sponsorship associated with televised coverage. Despite the liberalisation of gambling and its marketing, some restrictions apply.

The Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) oversee and implement the UK advertising codes that are written and preserved by the Committees of Advertising Practice (CAP). The CAP and British Code of Advertising Practice (BCAP) codes (Appendix 30, 31) set out the guidelines for both broadcast and non-broadcast material which oversee the content suitability and positioning of adverts. The ASA are empowered by Ofcom to take action if standards are not met (14). Since the Gambling Act (2005) there has been an explosion in gambling marketing. Ofcom (2013) reported an increase of 1444% in gambling adverts between 2005 and 2012 (1.39m per year). In terms of the 'market share' gambling adverts grew from 0.5% to 4.1% (720% rise) over the period in question. Despite the rules designed to protect children from being exposed to gambling adverts, the actual exposure levels to children between the age of 4 and 15 increased by 260% (0.5bn to 1.8bn - an average of 211 a month). BCAP rules for the scheduling of gambling advertisements say that gambling adverts must not feature in programmes aimed specifically at children. In terms of gambling adverts themselves, they must not: 'exploit the susceptibilities, aspirations, credulity, inexperience or lack of knowledge of under-18s or other vulnerable persons' or 'be likely to be of particular appeal to under-18's especially by reflecting or being associated with youth culture'.

One important factor in these exposure levels is the loophole in the regulations that exempt sports betting adverts during televised sporting events. For example, Ofcom statistics show that over 1.3 million children (4-15) watched the UEFA Euro 2012 match between England and France (aired 17.00-18.50 11/06/2012) and the match between England and Ukraine (aired 19.45 – 21.40 19/06/2012). Moreover, over 638,000 children watched the live UEFA Champions League final between Chelsea and Bayern Munich (aired 19.00 – 23.28 19/05/2012). 25% of the television audience for the premiere league are between 16-24 and 19% of the online audience are in this age bracket. These younger viewers would have been exposed to all the gambling (and alcohol) marketing during these broadcasts (15).

Prevalence

Football is an ideal vehicle for gambling marketing because the demographics of football fans ‘match’ the demographics of gamblers. Moreover, the future generations of gamblers are watching football and brand loyalty and identification can be established early. Football, the national sport in England, has a huge target audience (16.9 million people watched the game between England and Iceland at the European Championships in 2016) (16). Unlike alcohol, the published evidence about the prevalence of gambling marketing in football is scarce. Maher et al (2006) found that sport sponsorship associated with ‘unhealthy’ (alcohol, gambling, food high in fat or sugar) products were twice as common as ‘healthy’ products. Statistics from Ofcom show that adverts for sports gambling increased by 270% between 2011 and 2012. Even to the casual observer, the magnitude of gambling marketing in football is apparent. Gary Lineker, the former England striker and presenter of the BBC’s football highlights programme – Match of the Day – opined:

“The other thing that worries me is all the betting advertising and sponsorship in sport. All you ever see is commercials for gambling and apps, it is really dangerous and I think we need to do something about both of them, alcohol and gambling” (17)

The Ofcom statistics only take into account gambling adverts on commercial television, for example Ray Winstone’s long running bet365 adverts are particularly prominent during televised football. Recent research by the BBC (Reed 2017) found that roughly 95% of advertising breaks – during 25 live football matches – contained a minimum of one gambling advert. 20% of adverts were for gambling. The total number of adverts and sponsor breaks equalled 1,342 which means that 272 commercials advertised gambling. Interestingly, and perhaps based on different target audiences, for the one women’s football match included in the study not a single gambling advertisement was shown. The coverage of the recent FIFA World Cup in the UK provided further evidence of the problem. Research by the BBC found that most commercial breaks during coverage contained at least one gambling advert (62 of 66 in 11 games analysed) including pre-watershed coverage (18). In total the commercial channel ITV showed almost 90 minutes of gambling adverts during the tournament, double the amount for alcohol (19). Over 26.5 million people watched ITV’s coverage of the semi-final between England and Croatia including a significant number of children. The Advertising Standards Agency received complaints about the number of adverts but are empowered to act on content not prevalence.

There are a number of other ways gambling companies promote their products in sport which won’t show up in these figures. One key strategy is to sponsor the playing kit of clubs – so the players are walking (or running) billboards. In the 2004-5 English Premier League (EPL) season only one club’s shirts were sponsored by a gambling company (Middlesbrough –

888.com). At the start of the 2016- 17 season half of all teams - 10 - had a gambling company as their main shirt sponsors (see table 1.1) (20). Teams whose playing shirts do not feature gambling companies often have gambling 'partners' whose logos feature heavily elsewhere. For example, Liverpool FC have BetVictor (an online bookmaker) as a partner and training kit sponsor. The logo also appears on billboards at Anfield (likewise for other clubs with similar deals). The Industry Group for Responsible Gambling have agreed to a voluntary code not to include gambling sponsor's logos on children's merchandise. Cassidy and Ovenden (2017: 20), however suggest that under 18s are wearing replica kits with gambling sponsor logos. They found that 'children's' sizes generally go up to 14 years of age so older children are buying the adult kit. They conclude that the codes are "ineffective in preventing young people aged between 14 and 18, or indeed younger children who are large for their age, from wearing branded replica kit and in doing so, advertising gambling and alcohol while underage".

Monaghan et al (2008) claim that young people identify strongly with the brand that sponsors their sports team. The relationship doesn't just apply to certain clubs, some televised football broadcasts have been sponsored by betting companies (BT football coverage was sponsored by William Hill until the 2016-17 season). The second, third and fourth tier of British football are now the Sky Bet Championship, Sky Bet League 1 and Sky Bet League 2 and the Scottish Premiership is currently the Ladbrokes Premiership. The Welsh premier league – an amateur/semi-professional league, which include a team from Cardiff Metropolitan University – is sponsored by Dafabet. The highest levels of exposure are on commercial channels where adverts are present, but every shirt logo, pitch side hoarding, logo on manager's training kit, logos on press conference and post-match interview 'wall' (the backdrop covered in sponsor's logos) will also appear on the non-commercial BBC's live coverage (FA Cup), preview shows such as Football Focus and highlight programmes such as Match of the Day (MOTD).

Cassidy and Ovenden (2017) analysed 6 sports broadcasts (both public service broadcasts and commercial subscription broadcasts) featuring English Premier League (EPL) football matches including Match of The Day which regularly attracts over 4million viewers when shown on Saturday nights (post-watershed) and 2-3million viewers when repeated Sunday mornings (pre-watershed) (Broadcasters' Audience Research Board 2017). They identified an astonishing 764 instances of gambling marketing during the 3 MOTD broadcasts. Each was visible for between 2 (minimum for coding purpose) and 44 seconds with an average visibility of 7.57 seconds. Pitch side hoardings accounted for over 65% of references. Not a single 'gamble responsible' reference was made during the Match of the Day broadcasts. The MOTD broadcasts are also available on the BBC iPlayer service and can be watched by children at any time. During the 3 Sky Sports broadcasts televised on Sundays between 11.00 and 19.00 (entirely before the watershed) they identified 524 instances of gambling marketing lasting 11.89 seconds on average between 2 seconds and 149 seconds (11.89 second average).

There is significant variation between different broadcasts, but the 'perfect storm' occurs when both teams are sponsored by gambling companies; pitch side advertising hoardings feature gambling adverts (fixed and digital); the stadium is named after a gambling company such as Stoke City's Bet 365 stadium; and the match is televised on commercial television. None of the non-advert-based exposure is covered by the ASA guidelines. Football coverage can be accessed live on TV or the internet (legitimately and illegitimately), recorded and watched another time (children may watch recorded coverage if live broadcast

was late) therefore the total level of exposure to gambling brands is way beyond what can reasonably be measured.

Table 1.1 Premier league sponsorship deals 2016/2017

Tottenham	AIA (China)	16	Insurance
Southampton	Virgin Media (UK)	6	Telecoms
Sunderland	Dafabet (Philippines)	6	Gambling
West Ham	Betway (Malta)	6	Gambling
Everton	Chang Beer (Thailand)	5.3	Beer
C Palace	Mansion (Gibraltar)	5	Gambling
Swansea	Beteast (Costa Rica)	4	Gambling
Stoke	Bet 365 (UK)	3.2	Gambling
Hull City	SportPesa (Kenya)	3	Gambling
West Brom	UK-K8.COM (China)	2.5	Gambling
Bournemouth	Mansion (Gibraltar)	2	Gambling
Burnley	Dafabet (Philippines)	2	Gambling
Watford	138.com (China)	1.5	Gambling
Leicester	King Power (Thailand)	1	Duty Free
Middlesbrough	Ramsdens (UK)	1	Pawnbrokers
		226.5	

The impact of gambling adverts

Deans et. al. (2017) found that one of the biggest contributors to the normalisation of gambling was marketing. They conclude that the market, and particularly, the sports betting market, is saturated with betting products. The increasing exposure of gambling products not only normalises betting but entices young men to bet on sport (Deans et. al., 2017). There are good reasons to be concerned about the prevalence of gambling marketing because there is evidence that it translates into gambling behaviour. Hing et al. (2013) suggests that the intention to gamble may be elevated by gambling adverts during sports events, and it would be strange if this was not the case, given that is the desired effect of such marketing (in fact some of the adverts explicitly encourage ‘in play’ betting on the match being covered). Furthermore, their research suggested that the coverage can trigger further engagement (and therefore problems) among people already struggling or recovering from gambling problems. This increased engagement (or intention to gamble) applies to children also. Research on the impact of alcohol advertising on the consumption of alcohol by children and adolescents shows a clear association between exposure to marketing and consumption levels (Jones and Magee, 2011).

Similar results have been found for gambling marketing. Derevensky (2012:65) reports “that 47% of adolescent males and 38% of adolescent females reported that the gambling advertisements prompted them to want to gamble”. Felsher et al., (2004) found that 39% of adolescents would be more likely to purchase a lottery ticket after viewing an advertisement. Derevensky et al., (2010) argue that clinical accounts are now providing information confirming gambling commercials attack the vulnerability of certain individuals encouraging them to gamble more.

Recent gambling commission data suggests a decline of 11% in the gambling behaviour of 11 to 15 year olds between 2011

and 2017 (Wardle, 2018). However, the bulk of the can be accounted for by decreasing rates of private gambling (bets with friends or family) and gambling on National Lottery based products (lottery tickets, scratch cards and online instant wins) (Wardle, 2018) (21). The participation rates for other prominent forms of gambling – fruit machines, other machines and online gambling – have all remained stable. One potential reason for the decline in National Lottery based product purchases is the introduction of Challenge 25 (22). Data collected in 2018 by the Gambling Commission, reported that as of November 2018 14% of 11 to 16 year olds had gambled in the past week, an increase of 2% from 2017. In addition to prevalence data the Gambling Commission (2018) reported that in 2018 1.7% of 11 to 16 year olds are classified as ‘problem gamblers’ (this has risen from 0.9% in 2017) - roughly equating to 55,000 children. The number of ‘at risk’ gamblers has also risen (from 1.3% in 2017 to 2.2% in 2018) (23).

It’s not just the frequency of exposure that causes concern. According to Lopez-Gonzalez, Estevez and Griffiths, (2017b) Gambling advertisements tend to be shaped in a way that normalizes betting behaviour and targets vulnerable groups. Often, gambling advertisements core narratives offer two persuasive strategies. First, adverts attempt to lessen the observed risks associated with sports betting in four main ways; displaying characters that bet with friends, using celebrity ambassadors, indulging in comedy and offering free bets (Lopez-Gonzalez, Estevez and Griffiths, 2017b). Second, adverts focus on heightening the illusion of control and skill by drawing on themes such as sporting knowledge and increased masculinity. Pedalling the illusion of control and skill is a significant cause of concern in terms of problem gambling (Lopez-Gonzalez, Estevez and Griffiths, 2017b). Lopez-Gonzalez, Estevez and Griffiths, (2017a) claim that the content of sports betting adverts featured men almost exclusively with few or no women featured. The masculine narratives reproduce traditional stereotypes around gambling behaviour aligning betting with masculine ideals of self-efficacy and control, while downplaying risk. Their research also indicated evidence of co-representation between in-play betting and emotionally charged experiences. Live-betting situations heighten emotions, impulsivity and reduce inhibitions which are all correlated with problem gambling (McCormick, 1993; Nower and Blaszczynski, 2006). These issues were further exacerbated by the promotion of instant ‘in-play’ betting using mobile devices. The focus on the use of mobile devices is particular prominent in the adverts and is a major cause of concern because they exacerbate the risk factors above and eliminate protective factors (e.g. you can bet when drunk - see Deans et al 2016).

Moreover, using mobile devices is a central plank of contemporary youth culture and the ASA explicitly state that adverts should not appeal to under 18s ‘by reflecting or being associates with youth culture’ (24). During the World Cup Bet 365’s Ray Winstone was joined by a new character promoting Ladbrokes. The popular British actor Brian Blessed, noted for his booming voice, rode a bear into a pub (dressed in traditional Russian clothing) to promote the odds Ladbrokes were offering. The ASA guidelines explicitly mention that ‘Cartoon animals, fairy tales and colourful exaggerated graphics are likely to appeal’ to children. If it were to be accepted that this character and the structure of the adverts is particularly appealing and memorable to young children, then it should not be shown. It doesn’t seem that the ASA received any complaints (as far as we have been able to ascertain) about this advert on these grounds. The ASA only take action in light of complaints (25).

Although gambling companies would flatly deny any negative consequences of their marketing, there is no doubt that the marketing is designed to increase revenue and as we have seen, a significant amount of this revenue is drawn from problem

gamblers. Gambling adverts, like alcohol adverts, do have to display a warning or reminder about responsible consumption. Nevertheless, football allows and is arguably successful at targeting the next generation of gamblers and securing the future profits of the industry including through the addiction surplus.

There is a significant amount of literature on alcohol marketing and its effects in sport, whereas research on gambling marketing is scarce. We have argued that football is playing a significant and ethically problematic role in normalising gambling, associating gambling with many people's passion and sense of identity, and doing this despite laws and guidelines which are supposed to stop this happening. Moreover, football is profiting from the misery of problem gamblers.

There is a growing recognition that 'gambling' is not a neutral product. Gambling companies have voluntarily agreed to a 'whistle to whistle' ban on advertising during televised sport in the UK. This means that the half time commercial breaks will not feature any adverts. Adverts will continue to be shown before and after kick-off and broadcasts, teams and stadia will continue to be sponsored by gambling companies. Other organisations like the FA have abandoned their 'partnership' with betting companies (26). These changes suggest that the FA are taking its responsibility to protect the integrity of its sport and the welfare of its participants seriously (Morgan, 2010). There are some who fear the financial implications of refusing to take money from gambling companies, but similar concerns about the fate of sport in the absence of the tobacco industry's backing did not materialise.

Conclusion

Our aim in this paper was to draw attention to an important and hitherto under-examined issue in sport. Problem gambling is a public health issue and sport in general and football in particular is playing a problematic role in normalising and promoting gambling. Moreover, because current rules exempt the marketing of sports betting during live sports broadcasts, children and young people are exposed. In some games, the level of exposure reaches saturation.

In this paper we have sought to demonstrate that the actions of the gambling industry through their marketing in sport causes harm. Consequently we believe that this harm is sufficient warrant to compel gambling companies to eliminate (as far as possible) the harmful impact of their marketing on children. The issue is more difficult when it comes to adults. It could be argued that any restriction of gambling companies' activities directly or indirectly interferes with the rights of autonomous consumers to gamble. The discussion is complex, but let's formulate an objection in this way. 'I am an adult who likes to gamble and I object to any restrictions on my choice and ability to gamble brought about by advertising or marketing restrictions' (27). For Mill, the only justifiable reason for interfering with the liberty of another was to prevent harm to others. That harm might befall the gambler as a consequence of their autonomous decision is not sufficient warrant to interfere and is a form of paternalism. For Dworkin (1972: 65) paternalism is "...the interference with a person's liberty of action justified by reasons referring exclusively to the welfare, good, happiness, needs, interests or values of the person being coerced". Dworkin rightly points out that it is not always easy to work out if an individual act of paternalism is 'pure' in as much as the subject of restriction is also the sole beneficiary of the restriction. If we seek to restrict the gambler's opportunities (by limiting marketing among other things) other 'causalities' of gambling will be protected from harm. Consequently we might

justify the interference on the grounds allowed by Mill – protecting others from harm. Paternalism also involves the use of coercion “to achieve a good which is not recognized as such by those persons for whom the good is intended” (Dworkin 1971: 69). This is the key issue with respect to problem or at risk gamblers. Many gambling addicts actively campaign for restrictions such as maximum stake on Fixed Odds Betting Terminals (FOBTs), more strict and effective self-exclusion and the banning the use of credit cards for gambling among other things. In the moments of clarity between bouts of compulsive gambling they recognise that their desire to gamble does not equate to their good.

We believe therefore that restriction of gambling marketing in sport is further justified on the basis that the harms caused extend beyond the individual gambler and that problem gamblers in lucid moments desire such restrictions. A further question to be considered is the place of the ‘normal temperate gambler’ in legislation. This is an important consideration for all harm reduction debates. Why should I suffer (not have easy access) to gambling, alcohol, sugary drinks, tobacco, drugs or some such in order to protect ‘wantons’ unable to control their consumption.

References

- ADAMS, J., COLEMAN, J. AND WHITE, M., 2014. Alcohol marketing in televised international football: frequency analysis. *BMC Public Health*, 14(1), p.473.
- ADAMS, P.J., 2016. Moral jeopardy. Risks of accepting money from tobacco, alcohol and gambling industries.
- DEANS, E.G., THOMAS, S.L., DAUBE, M. AND DEREVENSKY, J., 2016. "I can sit on the beach and punt through my mobile phone": the influence of physical and online environments on the gambling risk behaviours of young men. *Social Science & Medicine*, 166, pp.110-119.
- DEANS, E. G., THOMAS, S.L., DEREVENSKY, J. AND DAUBE, M. 2017. The influence of marketing on the sports betting attitudes and consumption behaviours of young men: implications for harm reduction and prevention strategies. *Harm reduction journal*. 14(5).
- DEREVENSKY, J., SKLAR, A., GUPTA, R. AND MESSERLIAN, C., 2010. An empirical study examining the impact of gambling advertisements on adolescent gambling attitudes and behaviors. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 8(1), pp.21-34.
- DEREVENSKY, J.L., 2012. Teen gambling: Understanding a growing epidemic. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- DICKERSON, M., 2003. Exploring the Limits of 'Responsible Gambling': Harm Minimisation or Consumer Protection?. *Gambling Research: Journal of the National Association for Gambling Studies (Australia)*, 15(1), p.29.
- DWORKIN, G., 1972. Paternalism. *the Monist*, pp.64-84.
- FELSHER, J.R., DEREVENSKY, J.L. AND GUPTA, R., 2004. Lottery playing amongst youth: Implications for prevention and social policy. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 20(2), pp.127-153.
- GRUN, L. AND MCKEIGUE, P., 2000. Prevalence of excessive gambling before and after introduction of a national lottery in the United Kingdom: Another example of the single distribution theory. *Addiction*, 95(6), pp.959-966.
- HASTINGS, G., BROOKS, O., STEAD, M. 2010. Alcohol advertising: the last chance saloon: failure of self-regulation of UK alcohol advertising. *British Medical Journal*, 340:184–186.
- HING, N., VITARTAS, P. AND LAMONT, M., 2013. Gambling sponsorship of sport: An exploratory study of links with gambling attitudes and intentions. *International Gambling Studies*, 13(3), pp.281- 301.
- JONES, C., 2015. Football, alcohol and gambling: an unholy trinity?. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae: Kinanthropologica*, 51(2).
- JONES, C.Rh., 2016. Sport and Alcohol: An ethical perspective. Routledge.
- JONES, S.C. AND MAGEE, C.A., 2011. Exposure to alcohol advertising and alcohol consumption among Australian adolescents. *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, 46(5), pp.630-637.
- LOPEZ-GONZALEZ, H., GUERRERO-SOLÉ, F. AND GRIFFITHS, M.D., 2017. A content analysis of how 'normal' sports betting behaviour is represented in gambling advertising. *Addiction Research & Theory*, pp.1-10.
- LOPEZ-GONZALEZ, H., ESTEVEZ, A. AND GRIFFITHS, M.D., 2017a. Controlling the illusion of control: A grounded theory of sports betting advertising in the UK. *International gambling studies*.

LOPEZ-GONZALEZ, H., ESTEVEZ, A. AND GRIFFITHS, M.D., 2017b. Marketing and advertising online sports betting: A problem gambling perspective. *Journal of sport and social issues*, 41(3), pp.256-272.

MAHER, A., WILSON, N., SIGNAL, L. AND THOMSON, G., 2006. Patterns of sports sponsorship by gambling, alcohol and food companies: An Internet survey. *BMC public health*, 6(1), p.95.

MCCORMICK, R.A. 1993. Disinhibition and negative affectivity in substance abusers with and without a gambling problem. *Addictive Behaviours* 18:331-336.

MILL, J.S., 1974. *On Liberty*. London. Penguin.

MONAGHAN, S., DEREVENSKY, J., AND SKLAR, A., 2008. Impact of gambling advertisements and marketing on children and adolescents: Policy recommendations to minimise harm. *Journal of Gambling Issues*, 22, pp.252-274.

NOWER, L., AND BLASZCZYNSKI, A., 2006. Impulsivity and pathological gambling: A descriptive model. *International Gambling Studies*, 6, pp.61-65.

O'BRIEN, K.S., FERRIS, J., GREENLEES, I., JOWETT, S., RHIND, D., COOK, P.A. AND KYPRI, K., 2014. Alcohol industry sponsorship and hazardous drinking in UK university students who play sport. *Addiction*, 109(10), pp.1647-1654.

ORFORD, J., 2011. *An unsafe bet. The dangerous rise of gambling and the debate we should be having*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.

PURVES, R.I., CRITCHLOW, N., STEAD, M., ADAMS, J. AND BROWN, K., 2017. Alcohol marketing during the UEFA EURO 2016 football tournament: a frequency analysis. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 14(7), p.704.

REED, J. 2017. Gambling adverts 'in 95% of TV matches'. [online] BBC News. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-41693866> [Accessed 21 Nov. 2017].

ROSE, G., 2001. Sick individuals and sick populations. *International journal of epidemiology*, 30(3), pp.427-432.

WARDLE, H. 2018. Trends in children's gambling 2011-2017. Technical Report. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

YAU, M.Y.H. AND POTENZA, M.N., 2015. Gambling disorder and other behavioural addictions: recognition and treatment. *Harvard review of psychiatry*, 23(2), p.134

Footnotes

1 <http://www.scotsman.com/sport/football/teams/rangers/a-brief-history-of-joeey-barton-s-football-controversies-1-4234191> accessed 28/01/2018

2 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/30308203> accessed 12/05/2017

3 However, alcohol companies, most notably Carlsberg, have begun exploiting loopholes which enable them to market their products prominently during sporting tournaments (Carlsberg engaged in ‘Alibi’ marketing by displaying ‘probably’ and ‘the best in the world’ rather than ‘Carlsberg’ Purves et al [2017])

4 See Jones (2015).

5 <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2017/aug/31/uk-gambling-industry-takes-14bn-year-punters> accessed 28/01/2018

6 <http://www.cnwl.nhs.uk/news/problem-gamblers-cost-uk-government-1-2-billion-per-year/> accessed 28/01/2018

7 Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental disorders (DSM-5) <https://www.psychiatry.org/psychiatrists/practice/dsm> accessed 28/01/2018

8 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/30716977> accessed 24/05/2017

9 Certain gambling products are considered highly addictive because of certain features like frequency of stake.

10 http://www.abc.net.au/mediawatch/transcripts/1310_aps.pdf

11 <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/jan/22/nearly-one-third-of-alcohol-sold-in-england-drunk-by-4-of-population> accessed 24/01/2018

12 There was controversy following the FA cup tie between Sutton United versus Arsenal. Sutton’s reserve goalkeeper ate a pie on the substitute’s bench during the game. Sun Bets had offered odds of 8-1 on the ‘large’ player eating a pie during the game. The incident was investigated by the FA. <http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/fa-league-cups/sutton-arsenal-wayne-shaw-pie-bet-goalkeeper-gambling-the-sun-fa-a7590781.html> accessed 28/01/2018

13 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/football/24354124> accessed 28/01/2018

14 <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/> accessed 28/01/2018

15 Trends in Advertising Activity – Gambling (2013) Ofcom – available https://www.ofcom.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0026/53387/trends_in_ad_activity_gambling.pdf accessed 28/01/2018

16 <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2016/jun/28/itv-gets-warm-glow-from-ratings-as-iceland-freeze-out-england> accessed 28/01/2018

17 <http://www.marketingmagazine.co.uk/article/1306395/gary-lineker-condemns-dangerous-alcohol-betting-brand-sport-sponsorship-deals> accessed 7/06/2017

18 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-44564869> accessed 12/09/2018

19 <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2018/jul/15/children-bombarded-with-betting-adverts-during-world-cup> accessed 12/09/2018

20 In the 2017/18 season, 9 out of the 20 teams have a gambling company as their main sponsor.

21 The number of children purchasing National Lottery products fell from 11% in 2011 to 4% in 2017 whilst private betting fell from 12% in 2011 to 5%. See Wardle (2018) for more information.

22 Challenge 25 requires employees to ask for age verification for customers attempting to purchase age- restricted products (alcohol, cigarettes, lottery tickets, explicit magazines, scratch cards, medicines and Red bull), if that customer looks under 25, regardless of the fact the minimum age to purchase certain products might be 16 or 18.

23 <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/survey-data/Young-People-and-Gambling-2018-Report.pdf> accessed 10/01/2019

24 <https://www.asa.org.uk/advice-online/betting-and-gaming-appeal-to-children.html> accessed 19/12/2018

25 One of Blessed's other notable roles is Grampy Rabbit in the popular children's cartoon Peppa Pig.

26 <https://www.theguardian.com/football/2017/jun/22/fa-announces-end-to-sponsorship-deals-with-betting-companies>

27 We claim that the discussion is complex because there are two closely related issues namely the right and freedom to gamble and the right and freedom to see gambling promotion.